



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ing and need not be taken as a future. A parallel case, iv. 15, *ληθέμεν* is correctly rendered as a present rather than a future. A vexed passage, iv. 1487-88, is briefly treated in a footnote. The following is offered as a different approach to the difficulty. (1) The clause introduced by *τόφρα* is final, as in iii. 807. (2) *ἔων μῆλων περί* is a Homeric reminiscence (*Od.* xi. 403) and relates to an aggressor, striving for a piece of plunder. Therefore this prepositional phrase does not go with *ἀλεξόμενος*. (3) The word-order is important: between the subject of the verb and the verb itself are inserted the object, Canthus, the fight which he makes, and the purpose of the fight; then come further particulars about the subject. The difficulty, then, lies in the absence of a participle like the Homeric *μαχεούμενον* which is needed to help out the prepositional phrase. It is at least conceivable that Apollonius wrote the sentence as it stands and left the prepositional phrase "in the matter of his sheep" unsupported by a participle: "who in defending himself slew you with the cast of a stone, you who strove for his sheep that you might bring them to your needy comrades." In any case, the first part of Merkel's critical note seems to me the more valuable part, where he agrees with Schneider in removing the prepositional phrase from the nominative participle.

There are many difficult places where Mr. Seaton's translation shows how he deals with disputed points. It would lead one too far afield to pass these in review. Suffice it to say that the translation as a whole is a most welcome interpretation of the *Argonautica*.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

EDWARD FITCH

Kleine Schriften, mit einem Bildniss und zwei Tafeln. Von ALBRECHT DIETERICH. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. M. 14.

After Albrecht Dieterich's death in the summer semester of 1908 many of his friends and associates expressed the hope that the more important of his scattered articles might be brought together and reprinted in available form. The work was undertaken by Richard Wünsch, Dieterich's successor in the conduct of the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, who has given us a stout volume as a memorial of his friend. None of Dieterich's larger works—*Abraxas* (1891), *Nekyia* (1893), *Die Grabschrift des Aberkios* (1896), *Pulcinella* (1897), *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (1903, 1910²), and *Mutter Erde* (1905)—is here included, and of his numerous contributions to the *Realencyclopädie* only the "Aischylos" and the "Euripides" are reprinted, but the thirty numbers given display abundantly the interests, enthusiasm, and scholarship of their author. In date these papers range from that of the opening article, "Papyrus Magica, Prolegomena," which Dieterich developed from his doctoral dissertation and published in the *Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie*, Suppl. Bd. XVI (1888), pp. 749 ff., to the last two articles, "Der Ritus der

verhüllten Hände" and "Der Untergang der antiken Religion," which are here printed for the first time. Although most of these papers naturally deal with ancient religion and folk-lore, yet no less than seven—"De Hymnis Orphicis," "Die Zahl der Dramen des Aischylos," "Über eine Szene der aristophanischen Wolken," "Aischylos," "Die Widmungslegie des letzten Buches des Properz," "Euripides," and "Die Entstehung der Tragödie"—are concerned with literary matters; and one is that warm appreciation of Hermann Usener's services to the study of religion which Dieterich published in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* soon after his master's death in 1905. Whether it was wise to reprint all that is here included is an ungracious question, but one that may well be raised, especially with reference to such a selection as VIII, "Über den Ursprung des Sarapis," which is a mere summary of an address delivered before the forty-fourth annual meeting of German philologists and teachers in Dresden in 1897. A number of other papers also originated as addresses and have kept the character and style of the spoken word. If their author could have prepared such for reprinting, he doubtless would have added many notes to show the bases of his statements and to make clearer his attitude toward the results of his fellow-workers in the same field. Wünsch has done something to supply this lack, but the majority of the notes that are not drawn from material left by Dieterich refer to Dieterich's own work. In the case of a philologist of the very first rank there is often good reason for republishing his writings in the form in which they originally appeared; but Dieterich, in spite of his stimulating enthusiasm, his knowledge and insight, had hardly attained to the highest position when he was prematurely cut down; furthermore, it was characteristic of the man that his writings more often present suggestions and new points of view than offer complete treatment of his themes, carefully worked out in detail and supported by all the evidence. To recognize this fact is not to belittle Dieterich's work. Insight and the power to inspire others are rarer than the ability to work through in painstaking and plodding fashion a set task; and Dieterich showed in his earliest publications that he could employ all the arts of the minute and painstaking philologist and present a documented treatment with the best.

It is unnecessary here to sit again in judgment on the greater part of the book, for scholars have already given their praise or registered their dissent as the several articles have appeared. It will be better to speak briefly of the last two articles which are now printed for the first time, "Der Ritus der verhüllten Hände" and "Der Untergang der antiken Religion." The former has as its starting-point a fragmentary statue in the Capitoline Museum (Helbig, I¹, 405) which represents a person carrying a vase in covered hands, as if to protect the sacred object from profane touch; with this statue Dieterich compares a long series of Christian monuments, beginning with the fourth century and running down to the early Renaissance, in which persons are represented as receiving, offering, or holding with covered hands some

sacred object, e. g., the roll of the New Law, the martyr's crown, the keys of heaven, etc. Furthermore, this custom has lasted down to the present day in the ritual of the Catholic church, for the priest's hands are sometimes covered with a cloth before the elevation of the Host, monks on approaching the altar often conceal their hands in their robes, and a cardinal receives his hat from the Pope with covered hands. A similar practice was introduced by Diocletian into his court ceremonial and was continued at Byzantium, as stated by Constantinus Porphyrogenetus (*De caerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*, II, 21 and 28, Bonn). But the practice is much older, as literary and monumental evidence shows. Dieterich comes to the conclusion that the custom, originally Persian, was made known to the West by the campaigns of Alexander the Great, was taken into the ritual of Isis, as is seen in the well-known relief in the Palazzo Mattei, and gradually spread over the Roman world. Wunsch notes, however, that the custom was also native to the Roman worship of Fides. In spite of the fact that the last part of this study was not found among Dieterich's manuscripts and had to be reprinted from the summary in the report of the Second International Congress for the History of Religion held at Basle in 1905, the study is one of the best in the volume. It illustrates Dieterich's habit of looking at all questions from the historical point of view, without which he rightly held all attempts at interpretation are futile, and in spite of its incompleteness, it likewise shows how illuminating such studies may be made.

The final article, "Der Untergang der antiken Religion," deals with a subject which Dieterich treated several times in university and public lectures. The introduction and the first part are reproduced verbatim from his manuscript; Parts II-V had to be reconstructed from the notebooks of his pupils. But even so it is well that the paper has been reprinted, for, in spite of the summary form in which it inevitably now appears, it represents in outline Dieterich's views on the subject with which he was most occupied. His conception of his problem is best stated in his own words: "Den Untergang einer Religion darzustellen heisst in Wirklichkeit nichts anderes als die Geschichte dieser Religion darzustellen." That is, he conceived of religion as a living thing, which like every organism has from its birth the elements of decay as well as of growth within itself, and which is subject to modification by its environment. He divided his theme into five chapters: (i) "Die Revolution von oben"; (ii) "Die Revolution von unten"; (iii) "Die Revolution von aussen"; (iv) "Die religiöse Erregung der Massen"; and (v) "Der Kampf zwischen der antiken Religion und dem Christentum. Die letzten Kompromisse." The course of his thought is somewhat as follows. The commonly accepted beliefs and practices of the Greeks were threatened from above by the development of rationalism and skepticism among the educated classes. The whole course of philosophic thinking from Xenophanes on meant disaster to the older views. No less fatal was the use of allegory to which many resorted, notably the Stoics, in their attempts to square their

positions with the common beliefs. While these influences were operating from above, a faith in immortality and a longing after a happy life beyond the grave, which found their expression in the religion of Dionysus and in the various mysteries, made their way upward from the lower classes of society. These two elements Dieterich regards as the chief factors in the destruction of genuine Greek religion. From without the classic world came, in the Alexandrian and Roman periods, many gods, Isis and Osiris, the Baalim and their consorts, the Great Mother and Attis, Mithras, and the rest, whose religions likewise made life after death the chief concern of man. The syncretism of the day also threatened the old polytheism almost as much as did the monotheistic tendencies of philosophers. In longing for relief from their present distress and for assurance of future happiness, the masses turned feverishly to every new means offered; the resort to magic and to all kinds of superstition was common in every class of society from the lowest to the emperors themselves. The hope of a savior, of some man who would restore peace and happiness among men, was widespread.

Christianity was made known to the Hellenistic world by Paul, and first came into conflict with paganism at Rome; it soon made its way into the higher classes of society and did not suffer a systematic persecution until that of Decius in 250 A.D. The history of the hundred years from the end of the third century to the close of the fourth exhibits three phases of the struggle which are connected with three emperors, Diocletian, Constantine, and Julian. Under the first of these an attempt was made to uproot Christianity absolutely, but this was an impossible task, so well established was the Christian sect; under Constantine, Christianity gained the freedom enjoyed by other religions; and after Julian's gallant effort to regenerate paganism as a solar monotheism was cut short by his death, Christianity was left victorious. By the end of the century it had obtained its definite triumph under Theodosius. The pagan temples were closed or destroyed, yet the victory of Christianity was accompanied by many compromises which brought into the triumphant religion much from the old. To quote Dieterich's words again: "Solange ein Volk lebt, sind seine Götter unsterblich. Der alte Polytheismus sass tief in den Seelen der Menschen und war nicht ohne einen Vernichtungskampf, den man scheute, auszurotten. Aber er besass auch die Fähigkeit, sich in neue Formen zu fügen. . . . So ist denn der Untergang der antiken Religion zugleich die Genesis des Christentums, unserer eigenen Religion geworden, und dadurch, dass das Christentum Teile des Alten in sich aufgenommen hat, ist auch auf diesem Gebiet unsere Zeit die Erbin der Antike geworden."

There are many questions and objections which rise to one's mind as he reads this final article. For example, we should like to know what Dieterich meant by "genuine Greek religion." Hardly the religion seen in the Homeric poems, although he seems at one time to imply this. Again we would ask if it is necessarily true that the mysteries had their origin in the worship

of Hades and gods of the lower world alone; and we should like to hear what were the reasons for the victory of Christianity. On this last point Dieterich does not touch. But after all it would be ungracious to raise such questions, considering the conditions under which this article was printed. It is a more just and agreeable thing to express appreciation of the historical grasp and insight which the paper displays. They were indeed fortunate who heard the lectures and could enjoy Dieterich's persuasive enthusiasm.

The volume has as frontispiece an excellent portrait of Dieterich in his library, and as introduction Wünsch has reprinted with slight changes his biographical notice which first appeared in the *Jahresbericht* for 1910.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

RECENT LOEB LIBRARY VOLUMES

Cicero, Letters to Atticus. With an English Translation by E. O. WINSTEDT, M.A., in three volumes. Vols. I and II. Pp. ix+496 and xi+439.

Catullus, Tibullus, and Pervigilium Veneris. With Translations by FRANCIS WARRE CORNISH, M.A., J. P. POSTGATE and J. W. MACKAIL. Pp. xi+376.

The Greek Bucolic Poets. With an English Translation by J. M. EDMONDS. Pp. xxviii+527. New York: Macmillan, 1912-13.

Mr. Winstedt's translation presents the correspondence of Cicero up to September, 47, when the orator is at Brundisium, awaiting his fate at Caesar's hands. Nothing could be more clear, straightforward, and easy than the English of this rendering; it may be read almost without consciousness of the fact that it is translation. If there is ground at all for dissatisfaction, it is that the fulness of Ciceronian thought and the sweep of the Ciceronian phrase have been somewhat sacrificed to the ideal of English style—the latter, of course, inevitably—and that Mr. Winstedt's rendering lacks the variety of Cicero. The following passage will illustrate the character of his translation:

O suaves epistulas tuas uno tempore mihi datas duas! Quibus *εὐαγγελία* quae reddam, nescio; deberi quidem plane fateor. Sed vide *συγκύρημα*. Emer-seram commodum ex Antiati in Appiam ad Tris Tabernas ipsis Cerealibus, cum in me incurrit Roma veniens Curio meus. Ibidem ilico puer abs te cum epistulis. Ille ex me, nihilne audissem novi. Ego negare. "Publius," inquit, "tribunatum pl. petit." "Quid ais?"—

Fancy two such delightful letters of yours being delivered at one and the same time! I don't know how to pay you back for your good news, though I candidly